

To: Beck, Nancy[Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]
Cc: Scott, Gregory[Scott.Gregory@epa.gov]
From: Berkley, Bruce
Sent: Thur 7/20/2017 1:44:13 PM
Subject: FW: House Appropriations Committee Request for Chlorpyrifos Data & Documentation
[EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0062-0136 USDA Comment SAPdocket 050916.pdf](#)
[Transcript of April 19-21 2016 FIFRA SAP Meeting.pdf](#)
[EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0850-0833 USDA RHHRA Comment.pdf](#)
[EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0653-0369 USDA ProposedRuleComment Attachment3.pdf](#)
[EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0653-0369 USDA ProposedRuleComment Attachment1.pdf](#)
[EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0653-0369 USDA ProposedRuleComment Attachment2.pdf](#)
[EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0653-0648 USDA NODA comment.pdf](#)

Hi Nancy,

During the HAC hearings Congresswoman McCollum asked about Chlorpyrifos the Administrator committed to providing the peer reviewed science from USDA as well as EPA (see excerpt below). The attachments are the data that were provided by OPP to respond to the Insert.

Just wanted to get Senior Management okay for sending forward to OCFO and ultimately to the Hill. OCFO is trying to get this out today. Please let me know if you have any concerns with us sending this forward.

Thanks,

Bruce

Excerpt from HAC Hearing Transcript

Ms. MCCOLLUM. ...For example, the pesticide ban, which I mentioned in my opening statement, and its chlorpyrifos. Everybody says it differently because nobody knows how to say it right, right? But it is important that we do learn how to say it right because this chemical is very dangerous.

In December 2014, the EPA completed a human revised health risk assessment, and it was very highly sophisticated.

It was thoroughly peer reviewed. I know you said one of your goals is rule of law, but I think when science is looking at what to do about pesticides and toxins in our chemicals, they have to do no harm as their first goal.

The EPA determined that there is serious concern for long-term and neurodevelopment effects as a result of prenatal and possibly early life exposure. The Agency could not come up with any level that was safe on this toxin, and they do come up with some toxins that they find safe levels with. But on this one, they could not find anything.

So, I am curious to know, you know, you were there a month, and then this is reviewed. How did you come to find yourself disavowing going backwards, not looking at any of the scientific peer review on this pesticide? And then, with all the other cuts and the cuts in research, how am I going to have confidence that the best science that was used, that we do no harm to women who are pregnant, we do no harm to children who are born with, you know, possibly having all

these toxins lingering in their systems?

Mr. PRUITT. ...With respect to the decision on chlorpyrifos, the USDA had a completely different perspective, and, in fact, had made the EPA aware of that as the process was ongoing. And we based that decision, like we base every decision, it was based on meaningful data, meaningful science, and it was a decision that we felt that was merited based upon that, and a collection of information that we considered.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Could you provide this committee with the peer science from the other agency as well as the science from this Agency?

Mr. PRUITT. The USDA . We will provide that, yes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I want their peer reviewed science by comparable scientists, not someone's opinion. Okay.

Bruce Berkley

Deputy Director, OCSPP

Office of Program Management Operations

(202) 564-7802

From: Scott, Gregory

Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2017 8:28 AM

To: Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: House Appropriations Committee Request for Chlorpyrifos Data & Documentation

Do we

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Gregory Scott

Resource Management Staff

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

WJC East 3139E

(202) 564-7897 - Office

(202) 713-8338 - Cell

From: Guilaran, Yu-Ting

Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 4:57 PM

To: Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>

Cc: Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>; Katz, Brian <Katz.Brian@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>; Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>; Moore, Deon <Moore.Deon@epa.gov>; Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Friedman, Dana <Friedman.Dana@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: House Appropriations Committee Request for Chlorpyrifos Data & Documentation

Hi Gregory

Per Rick's email, attached please find USDA's comments on chlorpyrifos as well as their presentation at the 2016 SAP. As stated in our previous response, USDA's concerns mirrored

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Attachments

- EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0062-0136_USDA_Comment_SAPdocket_050916: USDA comment submitted to the SAP docket
- Transcript of April 19-21 2016 SAP Meeting: Page 411, line 22 through page 415, line 8
- EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0850-0833_USDA_RHHRA_Comment: USDA's comment on the Revised Human Health Risk Assessment that published January 2015
- EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0653-0369_USDA_ProposedRuleComment (note: three attachments): USDA's comments on the October 2015 proposed tolerance revocation – three attachments, one is the comment they submitted on the revised human health risk assessment (above)
- EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0653-0648_USDA_NODA_Comment: USDA's Comments on the November 2016 NODA

Regards,

Yu-Ting Guilaran, P.E.

Director

Pesticide Re-evaluation Division (PRD)

Office of Pesticide Programs

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

(tel) 703 308 0052

(fax)703 308 8005

Mail code 7508P

Room number PY S9623

From: Keigwin, Richard

Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 12:29 PM

To: Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>

Cc: Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>; Katz, Brian <Katz.Brian@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>; Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>; Moore, Deon <Moore.Deon@epa.gov>; Guilaran, Yu-Ting <Guilaran.Yu-Ting@epa.gov>; Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>

Subject: Re: House Appropriations Committee Request for Chlorpyrifos Data & Documentation

What we can provide are the USDA comments that were submitted during the various public comment periods, including their presentation at the 2016 meeting of the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel. All of this information should be in the respective public dockets. To the best of my knowledge, however, the information that USDA provided was not peer reviewed.

I defer to PRD and HED regarding how much time it will take to gather together this information.

Rick Keigwin

Acting Director, Office of Pesticide Programs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 19, 2017, at 12:10 PM, Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Rick et al,

During the House Appropriations Committee hearing on the FY 2018 President's Budget there was an exchange between Representative McCollum and the Administrator about Chlorpyrifos and a commitment by the administrator to provide data documentation from both EPA and USDA supporting the Chlorpyrifos decision. An excerpt of the transcript is below and the specific request from Rep McCollum is highlighted. We are now being asked to provide this documentation for the official transcript/record of the hearing. Can you please provide whatever documents that you believe best addresses the Administrator's commitment? Unfortunately we are short on time with meeting this request – can you also provide us an estimate of how long you will need to gather these materials so we can inform OCFO?

Thank you,

Greg

Excerpt from HAC Hearing Transcript

Ms. MCCOLLUM. ...For example, the pesticide ban, which I mentioned in my opening statement, and its chlorpyrifos. Everybody says it differently because nobody knows how to say it right, right? But it is important that we do learn how to

say it right because this chemical is very dangerous.

In December 2014, the EPA completed a human revised health risk assessment, and it was very highly sophisticated.

It was thoroughly peer reviewed. I know you said one of your goals is rule of law, but I think when science is looking at what to do about pesticides and toxins in our chemicals, they have to do no harm as their first goal.

The EPA determined that there is serious concern for long-term and neurodevelopment effects as a result of prenatal and possibly early life exposure. The Agency could not come up with any level that was safe on this toxin, and they do come up with some toxins that they find safe levels with. But on this one, they could not find anything.

So, I am curious to know, you know, you were there a month, and then this is reviewed. How did you come to find yourself disavowing going backwards, not looking at any of the scientific peer review on this pesticide? And then, with all the other cuts and the cuts in research, how am I going to have confidence that the best science that was used, that we do no harm to women who are pregnant, we do no harm to children who are born with, you know, possibly having all

these toxins lingering in their systems?

Mr. PRUITT. ...With respect to the decision on chlorpyrifos, the USDA had a completely different perspective, and, in fact, had made the EPA aware of that as the process was ongoing. And we based that decision, like we base every decision, it was based on meaningful data, meaningful science, and it was a decision that we felt that was merited based upon that, and a collection of information that we considered.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Could you provide this committee with the peer science from the other agency as well as the science from this Agency?

Mr. PRUITT. The USDA . We will provide that, yes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I want their peer reviewed science by comparable scientists, not someone's opinion. Okay.

Gregory Scott
Resource Management Staff
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

WJC East 3139E
(202) 564-7897 - Office

(202) 713-8338 - Cell